

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Agronsky & Company

STATION WTOP TV

DATE March 25, 1972 7:00 PM

CITY Washington, D. C.

COMMENTATORS PROBE CIA-ITT-CHILEAN CONTROVERSY

MARTIN AGRONSKY: George Meany led an AFL-CIO walk-out from the President's Pay Board this week. The White House immediately denounced this as sabotage of the administration's anti-inflation program. Mr. Meany's regarded as having raised a standard to which he wants labor to rally against Mr. Nixon in the election.

Life remains hard for Senator Muskie. Mr. Muskie hardly had time to make his victory statement in this week's Illinois primary when a new poll dumped him back into third place in the Wisconsin primary next Tuesday and made Hubert Humphrey the favorite.

Columnist Jack Anderson meanwhile continues to play David to the ITT Goliath. Anderson now accuses the ITT of having sought, with the collaboration of the CIA and the State Department, to interfere in the internal affairs of Chile by blocking the 1970 election of President Allende....

* * *

PETER LISAGOR: ...Martin -- Martin, I think the Democrats are looking up a bit now. They felt pretty -- they were cutting one another up. But with all the problems the Nixon administration has with ITT and with San Diego and with busing and with Meany and with other things, I think the Democrats can probably do a little gloating on their own, because there's competition for those headlines now in such a way that I don't think they ought to worry too much about cutting themselves up.

AGRONSKY: Well, Peter, they can, but they're not. I mean, one of the arguments that's being made all the way down the line is that none of the Democratic candidates are taking firm positions, that all of them are straddling and really waffling, as Jackson says.

-2-

Well, we'll come back to that in a minute.

*

*

*

AGRONSKY: ...All right. I think that's enough politics. Let's go to a much...

LISAGOR: You ask outrageous questions, Martin, you get outrageous answers.

AGRONSKY: Okay. Now, the ITT scandal. Now we've got, according to Mr. Anderson, documents that demonstrate that the Central Intelligence Agency, as well as the State Department, were involved in attempting to nullify the 1970 election of President Allende in Chile. I think it's fair to say that the Secretary of State denied that the United States, as he pointed out, intervened in any way in Chile. Let's carry it from there.

Jack, what do you make of it?

CROSBY NOYES: My name's not Jack, but anyway...

AGRONSKY: I'm sorry. Crosby.

LISAGOR: You're interchangeable.

NOYES: Well, I think the most interesting part about the ITT interference into the Chilean election was the total ineffectiveness of it. Apparently, they did a great deal of thrashing around and trying to get various agencies of the government to help them and other businesses in trying to stir up an army revolt, and all the rest of it. But none of it worked.

AGRONSKY: Crosby, are you accepting -- I mean, leaving aside whether it worked or not, are you accepting then that these documents which portray the CIA involvement along with the ITT is [sic] accurate?

NOYES: The CIA is naturally involved in a situation like the Chilean election in terms of following it and so on. But there's no evidence that they intervened.

I don't think any of these documents imply that the CIA was actively doing things to try to change the result.

AGRONSKY: Oh, indeed, they do.

CARL ROWAN: Martin, let me -- let throw in one little thing...

-3-

AGRONSKY: Yes, Carl.

ROWAN: ...the public ought to remember. Obviously, IT&T wants to protect its investments, and so forth. Obviously it's got a lot of guys in Washington who have to show that they're earning their fat salaries by running and talking to people.

But I still have no reason to know that they put the truth in their memoranda when they sent them off to ITT. He says I went in there; I talked to Meyer; and I went out to CIA and I talked to Broe. But how do I know that this guy isn't just making himself look good so his pay check keeps coming in?

AGRONSKY: Well your point being that you're not arguing that the memoranda themselves are genuine. What you're arguing is whether or not...

ROWAN: Oh, I'm sure they are genuine.

AGRONSKY: ...what the memoranda say happened actually happened.

ROWAN: Yes. They may be self-serving. Yes.

AGRONSKY: Peter.

LISAGOR: Whether it's true or not, the public is disposed to believe all this, Martin. And it's just another piece of evidence of corporate arrogance, Jack, not labor arrogance, or George Meany's arrogance, but corporate arrogance that was involved in the ITT anti-trust cases. They've become so big and so powerful that they really believe they could do just about what they want to with the American government.

And I might say that in those hearings when Phil Hart, Senator Phil Hart, asked Dean Griswold have these conglomerates gotten so big that the government can no longer govern, because if you divest them of certain companies you upset the economy, you upset the balance of payments. I thought that was the key question.

ROWAN: And the political system.

AGRONSKY: And the answer was?

LISAGOR: Well, Griswold sort of fumbled around.

-4-

He couldn't answer it. He said he thought it was a good question, and it remains a good question, because one has to ask how powerful do these conglomerates become that they can dictate policy on anti-trust, can, you know, contemplate at least interfering in a democratic election in Chile. And this is not new. Crosby's absolutely correct about the CIA. They've involved themselves in Guatemala years ago...

NOYES: And that's what their job is.

LISAGOR: ...and perhaps in some other countries we don't know about.

AGRONSKY: Well, why -- why -- why do we accept it so complacently? Maybe that's the other question...

NOYES: What? That the CIA is involved?

AGRONSKY: The CIA involvement. Their bag of dirty tricks department.

NOYES: That's what -- that's what they're supposed to do. I mean, that's one of the things that they're supposed to do.

AGRONSKY: That's what they're supposed -- they're supposed to prevent the -- the taking of office of a president who's popularly elected in Chile? That doesn't make you indignant? Doesn't worry you a bit?

ROWAN: Well, Martin, we don't know that they...

AGRONSKY: No?

ROWAN: ...Martin...

AGRONSKY: No? Okay, Jack.

ROWAN: ...We don't know that they tried to prevent his taking office. But we do know this...

AGRONSKY: We know the memoranda said that.

ROWAN: ...that in the elections in all of these countries you've got a game going where the Russians are trying to determine who wins by putting money in; the CIA is trying to do it. And that's the dirty way the game is played in the world today. And that's one of the terrible things about it.

-5-

LISAGOR: Well, since communist governments became a non-dirty name, Martin, as far as Washington is concerned, these kind of things don't work any more, because everybody doesn't rush and order the Marines into Chile because it has gone to a Marxist government. I think the overall policies have so changed that the CIA or ITT, or whatever, no longer has the kind of influence it once had.

AGRONSKY: Jack, where does the marker stand on your scale of indignation about this thing?

KILPATRICK: I'd rather talk about John Lindsay. What makes you think he'll be picked as vice president?

AGRONSKY: You want to skip that one entirely?

KILPATRICK: Oh, no, Martin. I read these Chilean papers...

LISAGOR: ITT fits all right in your ethical scale, doesn't it, Jack?

KILPATRICK: Ah, comme ce, comme ca. I thought the business in Chile, though, was just a couple of PR men running something up a flag pole to see who'd salute.

NOYES: Well, they were offering ten million dollars to get somebody to effect the results of the election, without any results.

AGRONSKY: All right, gentlemen. You've had the last word, Crosby. And thank you all very much.